



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/877,548	06/08/2001	Thomas D. Nadeau	50325-0571	9162
29989	7590	11/02/2005		
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			EXAMINER TIV, BACKHEAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/877,548	NADEAU ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Backhean Tiv	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 have been amended. This is a response to the amendment filed on 7/28/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,6,7,9,10,13,14,15,19,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,664,978 issued to Kekic et al.(Kekic) in view of US Patent 6,055,575 issued to Paulsen et al.(Paulsen) in further view of US Patent 6,539,483 issued to Harrison et al.(Harrison).

As per claim 1, Kekic teaches a method of controlling access of network management requests directed to one or more network devices that participate in a virtual private network(Fig.1-5c), the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of: receiving a request to carry out a management protocol operation(col.3, lines 34-col.4, lines 28); identifying, among a plurality of managed objects, a subset of objects that requests associated with the network are permitted to access(col.4 lines 31-49); and providing the request with access to only the subset of objects(col.4, lines 31-49).

Kekic does not however, explicitly teaches determining an identifier of a virtual private network in the request.

Paulsen teaches determining an identifier of a virtual private network in the request(col.7, lines 31-39).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Kekic to explicitly add determining an identifier of a virtual private network in the request as taught by Paulsen in order to authenticate the identity of the remote client(Paulsen, col.7, lines 34-35).

One skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Kekic and Paulsen in order to provide a method for secure communication between a remote computer and a private computer network(Paulsen, col.1, lines 8-12).

Kekic in view of Paulsen does not explicitly teach multiple network device participating in a VPN; managed objects associated with more or more second network devices participating in the VPN.

Harrison teaches multiple network device participating in a VPN(Figs.1-8, col.4, lines 25-67); managed objects associated with more or more second network devices participating in the VPN(Figs.1-8, col.4, lines 25-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kekic in view of Paulsen to use multiple network device participating in a VPN; managed objects associated with more or more second network devices participating in the VPN as taught by Harrison in generate VPN policies for devices in a computer network(Harrison, col.1, lines 14-17).

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Kekic, Paulsen, and Harrison, to provide a

system to generate VPN policies for devices in a computer network(Harrison, col.1, lines 14-17).

As per claim 2, a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the steps of providing, at one of the network devices, a mapping of a plurality of identifiers of virtual private networks to corresponding views of subsets of managed objects(Paulsen, Fig.1-4, Kekic, Figs.1-7).Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 6, determining whether the identifier from the request is in the view-based access control model table(Kekic ,col.3, lines 20-22, col.4, lines 32-49); when the identifier from the request is in the view-based access control model table: identifying a management information base variable referenced in the request(Kekic ,col.4, lines 32-49); based on one or more MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) Views referenced in the view-based access control model table, determining whether a protocol operation of the request is allowed for the variable(Kekic ,col.4, lines 38-42); dispatching information identifying the variable and the protocol operation to a code implementation of the protocol operation only when the protocol operation is allowed for the variable(Paulsen, col.9, line 33-col.12, line 67). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 9, Kekic teaches a method of controlling access of network management requests directed to one or more network devices that participate in a virtual private network(Fig.1-5c), the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

Art Unit: 2151

receiving a request to carry out a management protocol operation(col.3, lines 34-col.4, lines 28),extracting the value and determining a protocol operation that is embodied in the request(col.4, lines 31-49); using a view-based access control model(Figs.1-7),processing the requested operation only if access is allowed to managed objects in the management information base, based on the matching management information base view(col.4, lines 31-49); matching the value to a management information base view that corresponds to the requested operation(col.4, lines 31-49).

Kekic however does not explicitly teach the request contains a virtual private network identifier in a security name value(Paulsen, col.7, lines 31-39).

Paulson explicitly teach the request contains a virtual private network identifier in a security name value(col.7, lines 31-39);.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Kekic to explicitly add the request contains a virtual private network identifier in a security name value as taught by Paulsen in order to authenticate the identity of the remote client(Paulsen, col.7, lines 34-35).

One skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Kekic and Paulsen in order to provide a method for secure communication between a remote computer and a private computer network(Paulsen, col.1, lines 8-12).

Kekic in view of Paulsen does not explicitly teach multiple network device participating in a VPN; managed objects associated with more or more second network devices participating in the VPN; identifies VPN in a network.

Harrison teaches multiple network device participating in a VPN(Figs.1-8, col.4, lines 25-67); managed objects associated with more or more second network devices participating in the VPN(Figs.1-8, col.4, lines 25-67); identifies VPN in a network(Figs.1-8, col.4, lines 25-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kekic in view of Paulsen to use multiple network device participating in a VPN, and managed objects associated with more or more second network devices participating in the VPN, and identifies VPN in a network as taught by Harrison in generate VPN policies for devices in a computer network(Harrison, col.1, lines 14-17).

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Kekic, Paulsen, and Harrison, to provide a system to generate VPN policies for devices in a computer network(Harrison, col.1, lines 14-17).

As per claim 10, a method as recited in Claim 9, further comprising the steps of determining whether the request can be satisfied(Kekic, col.4, lines 31-49); extracting the security name value from a context string in the request(Paulsen, col.7, lines 32-45).Motivation to combine set forth in claim 9.

As per claim 13, the method as recited in Claim 10, further comprising the steps of determining whether the security name is in a view-based access control model table(Fig.33); when the security name is found in the view-based access control model table: identifying a management information base variable referenced in the

request(Kekic, col.4, lines 32-49); based on one or more views referenced in the view-based access control model table, determining whether the protocol operation is allowed for the variable(Kekic, col.4, lines 38-42); dispatching information identifying the variable and the protocol operation to a code implementation of the protocol operation only when the protocol operation is allowed for the variable(Paulsen, col.9, line 33-col.12, line 67); determining whether a virtual private network identifier is referenced in the request(Kekic, col.4, lines 32-39), processing the request using managed information objects in a default view when no virtual private network identifier is referenced in the request(Kekic, Figs.3-9D), and processing the request using management information objects in a view corresponding to the virtual private network identifier only when a virtual private network identifier is referenced in the request(Kekic, col.4, lines 32-39).Motivation to combine set forth in claim 6.

Claims 14, 19, 20 are rejected based on the same rationale as claim 1(see above). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

Claim 15 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 2(see above).
Motivation to combine set forth in claim 2.

Claim 7 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 6 (see above).
Motivation to combine set forth in claim 6.

Claims 3,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,664,978 issued to Kekic et al.(Kekic) in view of US Patent 6,055,575 issued to Paulsen et al.(Paulsen) in further view of US Patent 6,539,483 issued to Harrison et

al.(Harrison) in further view of RFC 2571, "An Architecture for Describing SNMP Management Frameworks", written by D. Harrington.

Kekic in view of Paulsen in further view of Harrison teaches all of the limitations of claim 1, however does not explicitly teaches as per claim 3, a method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising the steps of providing, at one of the network devices, a mapping of a plurality of identifiers of virtual private networks to corresponding views of subsets of managed objects, in the form of one or more entries in a view-based access control model table that associate SNMPv3 securityName values to corresponding MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) Views.

Harrington explicitly teaches a mapping of a plurality of identifiers of virtual private networks to corresponding views of subsets of managed objects, in the form of one or more entries in a view-based access control model table that associate SNMPv3 securityName values to corresponding MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) Views(pages 15-25).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Kekic in view of Paulsen in further view of Harrison to explicitly add a mapping of a plurality of identifiers of virtual private networks to corresponding views of subsets of managed objects, in the form of one or more entries in a view-based access control model table that associate SNMPv3 securityName values to corresponding MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE)

Art Unit: 2151

Views as taught by Harrington in order provide the framework for SNMPv3(Harrington, page 14).

One skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Kekic, Paulsen, Harrison, and Harrington in order to provide a method for improvement in the SNMP(Harrington, page 1).

Claim 16 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 3(see above).

Motivation to combine set forth in claim 3.

Claims 4,8,11,17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US Patent 6,664,978 issued to Kekic et al.(Kekic) in view of US Patent 6,055,575 issued to Paulsen et al.(Paulsen) in further view of US Patent 6,539,483 issued to Harrison et al.(Harrison) in further view of RFC 2575, "View-based Access Control Model for the Simple Network Management Protocol", written by B.Wijnen.

Kekic in view of Paulsen in further view of Harrison teaches all the limitations of claim 1, however does not explicitly teaches as per claim 4, a method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising the steps of providing, at one of the network devices, one or more entries in a view-based access control model table that associate SNMPv3 securityName values to corresponding MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) Views, wherein each of the securityName values is associated with a virtual private network, and wherein the corresponding MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) Views represent access control policies applicable to the associated virtual private networks.

Wijnen teaches at one of the network devices, one or more entries in a view-based access control model table that associate SNMPv3 securityName values to corresponding MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) Views, wherein each of the securityName values is associated with a virtual private network, and wherein the corresponding MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) Views represent access control policies applicable to the associated virtual private networks(pages 5-10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Kekic in view of Paulsen in further view of Harrison to explicitly add one of the network devices, one or more entries in a view-based access control model table that associate SNMPv3 securityName values to corresponding MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) Views, wherein each of the securityName values is associated with a virtual private network, and wherein the corresponding MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) Views represent access control policies applicable to the associated virtual private networks as taught by Wijnen in order to restrict access of the rights of some groups to only a subset of the management information(Wijnen, page 4)

One skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Kekic, Harrison, Paulsen and Wijnen in order to provide a method for remotely managing the configuration parameters for the View-based Access Control Model.

As per claim 8, a method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising the steps of: providing, at a network management station that is communicatively coupled to the

network devices, a mapping of a plurality of virtual private network identifiers(Paulsen, Fig.2) to SNMPv3 securityNames(Wijnen, pages 3-10); providing, at the network management station, an executable process that associates a virtual private network identifier with each SNMP request that is issued by the network management station to the network devices(Wijnen, pages 3-10). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 4.

As per claim 11, a method as recited in Claim 10, wherein the matching step further comprises the steps of determining whether the security name is in a view-based access control model table; rejecting and returning the request when the security name is not found in the view based access control model table(Wijnen, pages 3-10).

Motivation to combine set forth in claim 4.

Claim 17 is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 4(see above).

Motivation to combine set forth in claim 4.

Claims 5,12,18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,664,978 issued to Kekic et al.(Kekic) in view of US Patent 6,055,575 issued to Paulsen et al.(Paulsen) in further view of US Patent 6,539,483 issued to Harrison et al.(Harrison) in further view of US Patent 6,614,791 issued to Luciani et al.(Luciani).

Kekic in view of Paulsen in further view of Harrison teaches all the limitations of claim 1, however does not explicitly teach as per claim 5, a method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising the steps of providing, at one of the network devices, a mapping of a plurality of identifiers of virtual private networks to corresponding views of subsets

of managed objects, and wherein the steps of identifying a subset of objects and providing the request with access comprise the steps of: determining whether the identifier from the request is in the mapping; when the identifier from the request is in the mapping: identifying a management information base, variable referenced in the request; based on one or more views referenced in the mapping, determining whether a protocol operation of the request is allowed for the variable; dispatching information identifying the variable and the protocol operation to a code implementation of the protocol operation only when the protocol operation is allowed for the variable.

Luciani teaches the steps of providing, at one of the network devices, a mapping of a plurality of identifiers of virtual private networks to corresponding views of subsets of managed objects, and wherein the steps of identifying a subset of objects and providing the request with access comprise the steps of: determining whether the identifier from the request is in the mapping(col.2, lines 45-67); when the identifier from the request is in the mapping(col.2, lines 53-61): identifying a management information base, variable referenced in the request(col.2, lines 53-61); based on one or more views referenced in the mapping, determining whether a protocol operation of the request is allowed for the variable(col.2, lines 32-40); dispatching information identifying the variable and the protocol operation to a code implementation of the protocol operation only when the protocol operation is allowed for the variable(col.2, line 65-col.3, line 5).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Kekic in view of Paulsen in further view of Harrison to add determining whether the identifier from the request is in the mapping;

Art Unit: 2151

when the identifier from the request is in the mapping: identifying a management information base, variable referenced in the request; based on one or more views referenced in the mapping, determining whether a protocol operation of the request is allowed for the variable; dispatching information identifying the variable and the protocol operation to a code implementation of the protocol operation only when the protocol operation is allowed for the variable as taught by Luciani in order to support different protocols in a communication network(Luciani, col.1, lines 21-25).

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Kekic, Harrison Paulsen, and Luciani to provide a method for a shared communication network by multiple consumers(Luciani, col.2, lines 21-25).

Claims 12, 18 are rejected based on the same rationale as claim 5(see above).
Motivation to combine set forth in claim 5.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,664,978 issued to Kekic et al.(Kekic) in view of US Patent 6,055,575 issued to Paulsen et al.(Paulsen).

As per claim 21, Kekic teaches a method of controlling access of network management requests directed to one or more network devices that participate in one or more virtual private Networks(Figs.1-7), the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of: receiving a request to carry out a SNMP (Simple Network Management Protocol) operation directed to one or more managed objects from a

MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) (Management Information Base)

associated with one or more network devices that participate in the networks(Figs.1-44); identifying, among a plurality of managed objects from a MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) associated with a network device from the one or more network devices that participate in the networks(Figs.1-44), a subset of managed objects that requests associated with the particular network are permitted to access(col.4, lines 31-49); and in response to the request, providing access to only the subset of managed objects(col.4, lines 31-49).

Kekic however does not explicitly teaches multiple virtual private networks and determining, from the request, an identifier of a particular virtual private network of the multiple virtual private networks.

Paulson teaches multiple virtual private networks(Fig.1) and determining, from the request, an identifier of a particular virtual private network of the multiple virtual private networks(col.4, lines 22-63).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Kekic to explicitly add multiple virtual private networks and determining, from the request, an identifier of a particular virtual private network of the multiple virtual private networks. as taught by Paulsen in order to authenticate the identity of the remote client(Paulsen, col.7, lines 34-35).

One skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Kekic and Paulsen in order to provide a method for secure communication between a remote computer and a private computer network(Paulsen, col.1, lines 8-12).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,664,978 issued to Kekic et al.(Kekic) view of US Patent 6,614,791 issued to Luciani et al.(Luciani).

As per claim 21, Kekic teaches a method of controlling access of network management requests directed to one or more network devices that participate in one or more virtual private Networks(Figs.1-7), the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of: receiving a request to carry out a SNMP (Simple Network Management Protocol) operation directed to one or more managed objects from a MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) (Management Information Base) associated with one or more network devices that participate in the networks(Figs.1-44); identifying, among a plurality of managed objects from a MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) associated with a network device from the one or more network devices that participate in the networks(Figs.1-44), a subset of managed objects that requests associated with the particular network are permitted to access(col.4, lines 31-49); and in response to the request, providing access to only the subset of managed objects(col.4, lines 31-49).

Kekic however does not explicitly teaches multiple virtual private networks and determining, from the request, an identifier of a particular virtual private network of the multiple virtual private networks.

Art Unit: 2151

Luciani teaches multiple virtual private networks(Abstract) and determining, from the request, an identifier of a particular virtual private network of the multiple virtual private networks(Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Kekic to explicitly add multiple virtual private networks and determining, from the request, an identifier of a particular virtual private network of the multiple virtual private networks as taught by Luciani in order to support different protocols in a communication network(Luciani, col.1, lines 21-25).

One skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Kekic and Paulsen in order to provide a method for a shared communication network by multiple consumers(Luciani, col.2, lines 21-25).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments, as per claim 21, filed 7/28/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues in substance:

a) Kekic in view of Paulsen and Kekic in view of Luciani does not teach, "using a VPN identifier in an SNMP request", and "a VPN identifier, embodied in an SNMP request, for identifying particular VPN-associated managed objects form a MIB that is associated with a network device participating in multiple VPN";

In reply to a); In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a VPN identifier in an SNMP request and VPN identifier, embodied in an SNMP request) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Kekic teaches a method of controlling access of network management requests directed to one or more network devices that participate in one or more virtual private Networks(Figs.1-7), the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of: receiving a request to carry out a SNMP (Simple Network Management Protocol) operation directed to one or more managed objects from a MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) (Management Information Base) associated with one or more network devices that participate in the networks(Figs.1-44); identifying, among a plurality of managed objects from a MIB(MANAGEMENT INFORMATION BASE) associated with a network device from the one or more network devices that participate in the networks(Figs.1-44), a subset of managed objects that requests associated with

the particular network are permitted to access(col.4, lines 31-49); and in response to the request, providing access to only the subset of managed objects(col.4, lines 31-49).

Paulson teaches multiple virtual private networks(Fig.1) and determining, from the request, an identifier of a particular virtual private network of the multiple virtual private networks(col.4, lines 22-63).

Luciani teaches multiple virtual private networks(Abstract) and determining, from the request, an identifier of a particular virtual private network of the multiple virtual private networks(Abstract).

Kekic in view of Paulson and Kekic in view of Luciani in combination teaches all the limitation of claim 21.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2151

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571)272-3941. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 A.M.-12 P.M. and 1 -6 P.M. Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Backhean Tiv
2151
10/29/05



ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER